



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

REPLY.—No Protestant, or, indeed, any one in his right mind, can conceive that anything can be a duty—can be commanded by God to be done—which is, strictly speaking, “impossible”—that is, absolutely out of a man’s power to do. To talk of its being a man’s duty to go to the field of battle and fight for his country, if he were a bed-ridden cripple; or his duty to relieve the poor, if he were himself in a state of destitution, and had nothing to give; or to talk of commanding a man to “add a cubit to his stature,” or to fly in the air, would be to talk like a madman.

But though the word “duty” clearly implies “possibility,” Protestants may well be allowed to doubt the possibility of actually finding a man who has performed all his duties with unerring rectitude throughout his whole life, without ever committing even the smallest sin. This at least, however, is perfectly plain, that, supposing any such person actually to exist, neither he, nor we, nor any but the all-seeing God, could possibly know this with certainty, or could have any right to assert it. For “if we say that we have no sin (says the Apostle John), we deceive ourselves.” And this would be no less true, even if we really were exempt from all actual sin; we could not be authorized to say it, since we could not be infallibly sure of it.

And yet many Protestants, as well as Roman Catholics, are accustomed to speak of such and such a person as a “very worthy man,” as a “man of blameless life,” a “person of exemplary Christian character,” &c.; meaning, and being understood to mean, that such is the general tenor of his life; not that he was never guilty of any fault, small or great, in all his life. And this is the sense in which St. Luke’s description of Zacharias and Elizabeth is most naturally to be understood.

OBJECTION 44.—Many Protestants maintain, that God has not a sincere will of the salvation of all men, but only of the elect; and that Christ did not die for all.

Their Bible, in express words, confutes this error, when it tells us (1 Tim. ii. 3, 4) that God our Saviour will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth; and ver. 6, that Christ gave himself a ransom for all. And 2 St. Pet. iii. 9, that God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. And 1 St. John ii. 2, that Christ is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

REPLY.—The same remark is applicable here which was made in objection 42. Questions about predestination and election are nothing to the present purpose, since, on these points, both Protestants and Roman Catholics are divided among themselves.

OBJECTION 45.—Protestants will have it, that there is no middle place, or middle state of souls, after this life: but that all go straight either to heaven or to hell.

Their Bible teaches to the contrary (1 St. Pet. iii. 18, 19), 20, where Christ being put to death in the flesh, is said, by the spirit, to have gone and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, &c., which prison cannot be understood either of heaven or of the hell of the damned; for Christ certainly did not go to preach there; and, therefore, it must be a middle place.

REPLY.—Whatever this obscure text may mean (and Roman Catholics as well as Protestants differ very much among themselves on that point), it cannot refer to purgatory. For purgatory is said to be a place where the venial sins of Christians are purged away; whereas the spirits in prison are said to have been disobedient in the time of Noah, before the flood, and to have then despised the long-suffering of God; which was plainly a mortal sin. But the writer of the “Touchstone,” in order to make the text seem to favour purgatory, garbles the passage quoted from St. Peter, in whose Epistle the latter part of it runs thus:—“Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, when the ark was preparing, wherein few—that is, eight souls were saved by water.”

OBJECTION 46.—Protestants will have it, that there is no forgiveness of any sins in the world to come.

Their Bible declares the contrary (St. Matt. xii. 32), where we read, that the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven a man, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. Which words evidently imply that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come; though that particular kind of sin be excepted from this number, hence follows a middle place, which we call purgatory, because in hell there is no forgiveness, and in heaven no sin.

REPLY.—The most obvious sense of this passage would seem to be, that the sin in question will not escape divine judgment, either in the present world or in the next.

But if it had been designed to teach us that there is such a place as purgatory, and that persons are sent thither who die with sins unpardoned by God, and that they may afterwards receive pardon there, through the prayers offered up for them by their surviving friends, and masses said for them by priests, paid for that purpose, and indulgences sold by the Pope—supposing all this had been true, we may be sure the apostles and

other early Christian teachers would have set forth so important a doctrine very clearly and frequently in their writings.

This, every one knows, is what is done by Roman Catholic priests at this day; and, therefore, we cannot doubt that the apostles would have done the same, if they had known and designed to teach the doctrine. They would have spoken much, and strongly (as the Roman Catholic priests do), of purgatory, and of the efficacy of masses for the departed, and of indulgences; and, in particular, Peter and the other apostles would have dwelt much on the wonderful privilege bestowed on him and his successors, of delivering numberless souls from a place of torment in the next world.

Now of all this we find not one word in the whole of the New Testament—nothing about purgatory, or masses, or the power of the popes, or anything of the kind is at all mentioned by the sacred writers. Hence Protestants infer that all these things were unknown and unthought of in the early days of the Church, and are entirely an invention of man in later ages; and they are convinced, that if any one in Peter’s lifetime had supposed him to possess this wonderful power, and had come and offered him MONEY (as is done to the popes, who claim to be his successors), to release the souls of their friends from torment, he would have been likely to answer, “Thy money perish with thee!” “Do you think,” he might have added, “that if I had the power to deliver thousands of souls from unspeakable misery, I would wait to be paid for it?—to be paid for releasing a few, whose friends were able and willing to afford the cost, instead of at once, and without pay, delivering by one stroke of a pen, ALL souls from purgatory?”

Protestants, therefore, feel assured that no such applications were ever made to Peter, nor any such doctrine taught by him.

OBJECTION 47.—Protestants will not allow, that minute sins, in which the servants of God chance to die, will hinder them from going straight to heaven, or make them liable to punishment from the justice of God.

Their Bible on the contrary teaches (Rev. xxi. 27), speaking of the heavenly Jerusalem, that there shall in no wise enter thither anything that defileth. Now, every sin, be it ever so small, certainly defileth. Hence, we learn from St. Matt. xii. 36, that we shall be accountable, and consequently punishable for every idle word; and from many other texts we learn, that God will render to every man according to his works; and, consequently, will punish all the evil works, though ever so minute, in which a person dies without repentance.

REPLY.—Repentance is (as the original word implies) a change of mind; and if a man be so changed in mind that he is no longer disposed to commit sins great or small in the future state, then he is fit to go straight to heaven. But if he is not so changed, purgatory cannot help him, unless the pains of purgatory produce such a change. Now, if the pains of purgatory are necessary to work such a change, why do the popes and Roman Catholic priests take money to free people from those pains which are necessary to making them fit for heaven? And if those pains are not necessary, why may not such a saving change be wrought by Christ “without money and without price,” as well as by the Pope for money, and at a heavy price? Or, is there any text which says that God will punish all evil works, except the sinner or his friends pay for an indulgence? But the best Roman Catholic divines hold generally that the pains of purgatory produce no inward change of mind at all, but that a man must be fit (in his inward disposition) to go straight to heaven before he enters purgatory, or else can never be fit for heaven. In purgatory, they say, he only pays the penalty of his sins. Now, Protestants have learned from Holy Scripture that the penalty of sin has been borne by Christ, and that all that is required on our parts is to quit our sin.

(To be continued.)

## Correspondence.

### BAPTISM OF BELLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR.—In reading, in your last publication, an interesting article on the baptism of bells, I was reminded of conversations I had held, when residing on the Continent, with different persons there, on the subject of that strange ceremony, which, in Roman Catholic countries, is by no means uncommon. I learned from them circumstances connected with it which may readily account for a custom so little in accordance with the intellectual enlightenment of the age, being still adhered to by the Roman Catholic clergy. It is customary on those occasions for the curé (parish priest) or the bishop, if present, to invite the richest lady and gentleman in the parish or neighbourhood to undertake the offices of sponsors. They, in return for this honour, feel themselves bound, by etiquette, if not by duty, to present their interesting god-child with a handsome pecuniary donation on the occasion of her baptism. She, on the other hand, with the most exemplary regard for her spiritual pastors and masters, leaves this money altogether at their disposal; so that this religio-comic ceremony can be traced to the same objects as many of the other

practices taught by Rome—namely, that of enriching her clergy. Often have I felt an earnest and affectionate desire that our dear Roman Catholic brethren would open their eyes to this painful truth, and, with candid impartiality, trace one by one the peculiar tenets of their creed to their real source. Then would they soon learn that the system by which they have been long deceived, deserves but too truly the title which the pious Napoleon Roussell has bestowed upon it, “*La religion d’argent*”—the religion of money.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

A LOOKER-ON.

## IMAGE WORSHIP AND MIRACLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—The crowded state of your pages, and the mass of matter you must have on hand, has, no doubt, compelled you to curtail your remarks on the extraordinary letter of your correspondent “Sidrach” (vol. ii., p. 21). May I be permitted to add a few observations?

I. “Sidrach” quotes the decree of Trent on the subject of “sacred images,” but he quotes only in part. The decree continues—“But because the honour which is shown unto them (the sacred images) is referred to the prototypes which they represent, in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear.”—Sess. 25.

This practice, in this very decree, the Council declared to be “according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and according to the consent of the holy Fathers.” And this 25th Sess. winds up with the grandiloquent words—“We all thus believe, we all think the very same: we all, consenting and embracing them, subscribe. This is the faith of blessed Peter and of the Apostles; this is the faith of the Fathers; this is the faith of all the orthodox. Thus we believe, thus we think, thus we subscribe. Amen: anathema to all heretics—anathema—anathema!”

And thus “Sidrach,” we presume, believes, excepting, perhaps, the kissing and prostrating part of the decree. But must he not accept the decree in its entirety, or not at all? And here let me remind him, that we (Protestants) do not kiss, or uncover our heads, or prostrate ourselves before the “statues of Wellingtons, Nelsons, Williams, Georges, and a host of other deified (?) personages.” The parallel he would make does not hold good.

“Sidrach” has, doubtless, a sincere reverence for the “Fathers” and primitive writers invoked in the above decrees. Perhaps, however, he does not know that this very relative worship, so boldly advocated by the “Sacred Council of Trent,” was the identical species of worship, or honour, which the primitive Christians most emphatically denounced. Let me take as examples Arnobius, Lactantius, Origen, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, and see how they opposed the reasoning of the orthodox heathen belief with regard to image worship.

Lactantius, about A.D. 300, said—“Beyond all doubt, wherever an image is there is no religion.”—Lact. Divin. Instit., lib. ii., c. xix.

Arnobius, who flourished at the beginning of the third century, and had been himself a zealous pagan before his conversion to Christianity, thus remonstrated with the heathen idolators—“You say, ‘We worship the gods through the images.’ What then? If these images did not exist, would the gods not know they were worshipped, nor be aware of any honour being paid to them by you? What can be done more unjust, more disrespectful, more cruel, than to recognise one as a God, and offer up supplication to another thing; to hope for help from a Divine being, and pray to an image which has no sense?”

Again he proceeds—“But ye say, ‘You are mistaken: we do not consider materials of brass, or silver, or gold, or other things of which the statues are made, to be of themselves gods, or sacred divinities; but in these materials we worship and venerate those gods whom the holy dedication brings in, and causes to dwell in the images wrought by the craftsman.’”—Arnob., lib. v., c. ix. and c. xvii., Leipsic Edit. 1816.

Origen thus strongly condemns, by anticipation, this modern heathenism, in his writings against the heathen Celsus—“What sensible person would not laugh at a man (he says) who . . . looks to images, and there offers up his prayer to them, or, beholding them, REFERS IT TO THE BEING CONTEMPLATED IN HIS MIND, to whom he fancies that he ought to ascend from the visible object, which is the symbol of him (whom the image is supposed to represent).”—Cont. Cels., lib. vii., cxliv.

Saint Ambrose also thus speaks of this heathen worship—“This gold, if carefully handled, has an outward value; but inwardly it is mere ordinary metal. Examine, I pray you, and sift thoroughly the class of Gentiles. The words they utter are rich and grand; the things they defend are utterly devoid of truth; they talk of God—they worship an image.”—Amb. ad Vaten. Epist., cap. i.—xviii. Venice, 1781.

Saint Augustine, arguing against the nice distinctions

made by the heathen idolators of his day, and which your correspondent, "Sidrach," is perhaps prepared to defend, says—"But those persons seem to themselves to belong to a more purified religion, who say—'I worship neither an image nor a demon, but I regard the bodily figure as the representative of that being whom I ought to worship.' . . . And when, again, with regard to these, they [the more enlightened heathens] begin to be pressed hard on the point, that they worship bodies . . . they are bold enough to answer, that they do not worship the bodies themselves, but the divinities which preside over and rule them."—Aug., in Psalm xciii., part 2, vol. iv., p. 1261. Paris, 1679. "But some disputant comes forward, and, very wise in his own conceit, says—'I do not worship that stone, nor that insensible image; your prophet could not know that they have eyes and see not, and I be ignorant that that image neither hath a soul, nor sees with his eyes, nor hears with his ears. I do not worship that, but I adore what I see, and serve him whom I do not see.' And who is he?—a certain, invisible divinity, which presides over that image."—Aug., in Psalm xcvi., vol. iv., p. 1047. And, once again, Augustine says—"And lest any one should say, I do not worship the image, but that which the images signify, it is immediately added, and they worshipped and served the creature more than the creator. Now, understand well, they either worship the image or a creature; he who worships the image converts the truth of God into a lie."—Aug., Serm. cxvii., vol. v., p. 905.

I might say much more on this, as also the entire repudiation by the early Church of the use of images in churches or elsewhere for religious purposes; but I think enough has been given to supply matter for grave consideration for any Roman Catholic desirous of learning what the primitive Christians taught with respect to images. Will "Sidrach" pronounce St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Lactantius, Arnobius, and Origen arch-heretics, for thus writing? and is it possible that any of these great writers would have consented to the decree of the Council of Trent, which exhorted "all bishops, and others sustaining the office and charge of teaching, especially to instruct the faithful, that images of Christ, the Virgin, and other saints are to be had and retained, particularly in temples, . . . that due honour and veneration are to be awarded to them, because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; in such wise that the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear?"

II. "Sidrach" speaks, as the Council of Trent does, of the "due honour and veneration" which is to be paid to images; but who is to know what amount of religious worship is sanctioned by the Church of Rome under the word "due"? "Sidrach" may repudiate direct idolatry; but hear what Bellarmine says on this subject, and he cannot be accused of misrepresenting the tenets of his church. In his treatise on "Sacred Images," book ii., ch. 20, he thus discusses the subject:—"The question proposed is, with what sort of worship are images to be honoured? There are three opinions." The first he rejects—namely, "that the faithful ought to do no more, with regard to images, than to worship before them: not to worship the image, but the prototype, the exemplar, the original, the Being of which the image is the representation." The second opinion, and which is the one under consideration, he in no wise objects to, and which is, "that the same honour is due to the image as to the exemplar; and thence, that the image of Christ is to be worshipped with the worship of *Latria* (the species of worship rendered by Roman Catholics to the Most High God), the image of the Blessed Virgin with the worship of *Hyperdulia*, and the images of the other saints with the worship of *Dulia*." Under this class he ranks the famous Roman Catholic theologians and divines—Alexander, the "blessed saint, St. Thomas Aquinas," Cardinal Cajetan, the "blessed St. Bonaventure, Marsilius, Almayne, Carthusian, and others." With reference to Aquinas it may be as well to remark, that he justifies himself for giving the selfsame worship to the wooden cross as he gives to God himself by the ritual of his church. His words are—"We offer the supreme adoration of *Latria* to that Being in whom we place our hope of salvation; but we place our hope of salvation in the cross of Christ; for the Church sings, 'Hail, O cross, our only hope in this time of passion, increase righteousness to the pious, and grant pardon to the guilty.' Therefore, the cross of Christ is to be adored with the supreme adoration of *Latria*."—Thos. Aquinas, Theo. Sum., part iii., Rome, 1686, quest. 25, art. 1-4; and see Lib. iii., Dist. ix., Salut. iv., Venice, 1780.

Lest it should be supposed that all this is mere figurative language, the "Pontificale Romanum" directs that the cross of the Pope's Legate be carried in the right hand, giving as a reason, "because *Latria* is due to it" [Quia debetur ei *Latria*. Romæ 1818, p. 468]. Aquinas belonged to the Order of Dominicans; so does the present Pope, and, if I mistake not, Dr. Wiseman also. Now, "in the Dominican Order, the degree corresponding to that of doctor in the secular clergy, and also this title, conferred on these by the Dominicans, through

special privilege, is given upon a stipulation, *ON OATH*, to teach the doctrines of St. Thomas on every point."—Dublin Review for June, 1850, p. 476.

III. With reference to the pretended miracles of his church, "Sidrach" expresses himself with earnest and just indignation. He "utterly discards such absurd stories as the pretended miracles to which you refer, no matter how great the number of rogues or fools you name as a proof that they believed in them." He is too hasty in his condemnations. Does he not know that the present Pope himself admitted and recognised the truth of the wonderful winking statue of Rimini? Is he aware that as wonderful stories as that told by your correspondent, relative to the "black virgin" catching the enemies' cannon balls, are related in the Roman Catholic priests' "vade mecum," the Breviary? Can he be aware that, in Liguori's "Glories of Mary"—a book in Ireland more common than the Bible—is replete with such "lying wonders?" and yet this very book is not only printed with the sanction of all the Roman Catholic clergy, including Cardinal Wiseman\* himself, but is also most unequivocally accepted by the whole Roman Church, which had declared that there is not one word in it worthy of censure.† Let "Sidrach" procure one of the Dublin editions of this work, and he will find that popes, bishops, and priests come within his sweeping condemnation as "rogues and fools." Had a Protestant used such language, he would have been called abusive and uncharitable.

I am willing to believe that your correspondent, "Sidrach," and many other of our Christian brethren, are Roman Catholics only from education, prejudice, and ignorance of the true Gospel of Jesus Christ; did they know the doctrines and teaching of their Church, and what true Protestantism is, they would cease to be members of the Roman Church; and may God grant that your efforts, Mr. Editor, through your excellent journal, may, through his gracious assistance, be the means of enlightening our Roman Catholic brethren to the truth as it is in Jesus.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
C. H. COLLETTE.

#### ON DIVORCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—By reference to the leading article of my letter, published in the LAYMAN for December, 1852, it will be seen that I have admitted the connection of the Church of England with the State, and also the readiness of her ministers to re-marry divorced parties; but permit me to say, that I have yet to learn, for you have not explained, by what Scripture authority these marriages are sanctioned.

You say the legislature grants divorces in cases of adultery, and for no other cause. Our Saviour, in the Gospel, permits divorces for the same cause—adultery or fornication (Mat. v. 32); and hence it is plain, if a man put away his wife for any other cause, he cannot be said to have put her away by the authority of a divorce, or by permission either of the legislature or of the Church and ministers of Christ. If I understand you rightly, you assert that "the prohibition to marry applies only to her who is put away in this last-mentioned manner."

Now, this being the case, let me ask you, how can the prohibition to marry apply to her who is already married, and to whom neither the Church nor the State can grant a divorce?

The clause, "saving for the cause of fornication," is not an exception to any other principle or condition laid down by our Saviour in the text; neither can it be understood as permissive of a second marriage of the divorced parties; but it is evidently in *antithesis* with the causes of divorce allowed by Moses (Deut. xxiv. 1), and with the many other causes which were subsequently admitted, and which the carnal Jews considered they should be allowed at pleasure, as Josephus bears testimony.

For an additional illustration of this view of what you call a "special exception," allow me to direct your attention to (Mat. xix. 3, 9) where our Lord uses the same exception, "except it be for fornication," evidently as a precise, direct, and definite reply to the Pharisees' question, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every crime?" and thereby establish the fact, that for no cause, "except it be for fornication," shall he be allowed to put her away; and he adds, that "whosoever marieth her that is put away doth commit adultery." Again (Mat. x. 2), the Pharisees "asked him, is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" Our Lord, anticipating the tempting interrogatories of the Pharisees, declared, in his Sermon on the Mount, as explained above, that it cannot be lawful, "saving for the cause of fornication," and referring the Pharisees to Gen. ii. 24, for an answer; at the request of his disciples, when they were in the house alone, he explains the matter to them, as recorded in

Mark x. 11, 12, omitting the exceptional phrase. The exception is also omitted in Luke xvi. 18; but from the seeming discrepancy of diction between these two texts, I presume no man will maintain that the evangelists established conflicting points of doctrine, or that they did not all understand this subject in the same way. St. Paul (in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11) inculcates the same doctrine, and he adds, "let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband."

Now, it is plain St. Paul never would have counselled the woman to be reconciled to her husband, without being re-married, if the first marriage had been dissolved by the separation or divorce of the parties.

I find the re-marrying of divorced parties strictly prohibited by the "canons ecclesiastical" of the Irish Church, to which I beg to call your attention.

The 55th canon provides, that "in all sentences pronounced only for divorce and separation, a *Thoro et Mensa*, there shall be a caution and restraint inserted in the act of the said sentence, that the parties so separated shall live chastely and continently; neither shall they, during each other's life, contract matrimony with any other person; and for the better observing of this last clause, the said sentence of divorce shall not be pronounced until the party or parties requiring the same have good and sufficient caution, and security into the court, that they will not any way break or transgress the said restraint or prohibition."

By your own admission, the doctrine of the Church of England at present, as regards divorces and the re-marrying of the parties, is entirely at variance with the dictates of this canon. Does not this look somewhat like a *developing principle*?

If, in the foregoing lines, I have mistaken your views of any point, I am open to conviction, and shall gladly acknowledge my error, if pointed out; and as my object is fair and impartial discussion, and studiously to avoid everything that might give offence, I hope I have used "the sound word that cannot be blamed" (Tit. ii. 8), that truth may be established, until we all meet in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God—Ephes. iv. 13.

I am, sir, with sincere regard,  
Your obedient servant,  
EDMOND POWER.

The subject referred to in the above letter was at first introduced by us incidentally and briefly, merely to illustrate another question. It was never intended by us as a prominent subject of discussion in our pages, to which it is not suited. We should have declined to continue such a discussion; but our correspondent's letter is written in so calm and candid a spirit of discussion that we are most unwilling to refuse insertion to anything that comes from him. We, therefore, insert his letter, with a brief reply to its arguments, which must conclude this subject; and we do so in the hope that our correspondent will then turn his attention to the greater and more important subjects, for the discussion of which our paper was established. In discussing those great subjects we shall be happy to have the assistance of a writer so dispassionate and so intelligent.

The strength of our correspondent's argument appears to us to lie in this—he rightly says that Christ's law does not allow of divorce except for adultery or fornication, and, therefore, if a man put away his wife for any other cause, &c., the marriage between them still exists. And he says—"Now, this being the case, let me ask you, how can the *pro*-hibition to marry apply to her who is already married, and to whom neither the Church nor the State can grant a divorce?" And hence he concludes, that our Saviour's prohibition to a divorced woman to marry cannot be intended of any but of her who is divorced for adultery. We hope Mr. Power will think this a fair statement of his argument; and we answer it thus—In the place in question (Matt. v. 31), our Saviour said—"It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce." And from St. Mark x. 3 and 4, we find that it was in the law of Moses that this was said: and if we look for it in the law of Moses, we find it in Deuteronomy xxiv. 1. In verse 2 we find that the woman so put away was permitted to be married to another man; or, at least, that such was the practice. We are satisfied that the former is the right interpretation of the verse, but the latter is quite sufficient for our present practice. So, when our Saviour spoke, it was a prevailing practice among those he spoke to, to marry women who were divorced from their husbands for other causes besides adultery. And could anything be more necessary than for our Saviour, in establishing his law, to forbid this practice for the future? This was the application which we gave of the passage. Mr. Power, in his argument above stated, thinks that there could not have been any room for our Saviour to have spoken the words in that sense; but we have shown that there was an absolute necessity for our Saviour to speak the words in that sense; and, therefore, we conclude that this really was the sense of them.

Mr. Power has mistaken the meaning of the 55th canon of the Church of Ireland, which he quotes. Any one conversant with the law of our courts will tell him that the "divorce" there spoken of is not meant of "divorce" in the sense of dissolving a marriage. It is,

\* Cardinal Wiseman has just put his seal of authority to the last edition of this work—London, Wallwork, 1852—"I hereby approve of this translation of the Glories of Mary, and cordially recommend it to the faithful. (Signed) N. Card. Wiseman, Archb. of Westminster."

† See Roman Catholic Calendar for 1845, p. 167.